



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/528,594	03/21/2005	Haruya Hashimoto	10921.0291USWO	7145
52835	7590	08/08/2006	EXAMINER	
HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER & LARSON, P.C. P.O. BOX 2902 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0902			LUK, EMMANUEL S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1722	

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/528,594

Applicant(s)

HASHIMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Emmanuel S. Luk

Art Unit

1722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 10(a) as being unpatentable over Nimura (5762983).

Nimura teaches the claimed apparatus having a mold for forming an air bag, grooving blade (3), supporting members (14) that are rods, movable core (15), and recess (13b). Nimura also teaches the grooving blade (3) on a section of the movable core (32) and the movable core sections (32, 36) wherein section 32 can be also considered a supporting member that is extends through the movable core.

Nimura fails to teach the plurality of blades.

The plurality of blades is a design choice that allows for a multiplied effect of having multiple blades on the mold surface for shaping the product as opposed to a

Art Unit: 1722

single groove blade and thus it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified Nimura with multiple grooving blades.

4. Claims 4-10, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nimura (5762983) in view of Sorenson (4867672).

Nimura fails to teach a drive block, follower block, and an inclined cam surface. Nimura does teach two different mold core sections, one section 32 being movable while another section having the grooving blade does not move with the outer sections and Nimura also teaches rods for the supporting member that is also independently operable.

Sorenson teaches a 'block' (20) that is in connection with the inclined cam surface (16) of the 'drive block'. See Figures 1 and 2.

It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify Nimura to have a second drive source for operating the section with the grooving blade.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nimura with a drive element for the movable core as taught by Sorenson for control of the mold element.

5. Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nimura in view of Kikuchi (6042363).

Nimura fails to teach cooling means for the movable core, including a duct in the movable core and another in the follower block.

Nimura teaches a duct (67) for cooling that is located in the movable core (20) and in the 'follower' block (60). The follower block (34) also teaches the concept of a connecting member that would connect a plurality of grooving blades and a support member (31) is the support member that is a rod extending through the connecting member.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nimura with the cooling means in the movable core as taught by Kikuchi for cooling the article and shortening the process.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 11-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of reference fails to teach a mold having a supporting member, movable core, follower block and driving block, grooving blade with second drive source, and further having auxiliary block with the second drive source being provided at the support body.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 6/1/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments concerning the grooving blades have been noted. In regards to the air bag cover features such as the break grooves, this is an intended use of the apparatus for a specific product and the break grooves themselves relate to the product. The arguments concerning the placement of the pushing pins being outside of the air bag door region defined by the tearing lines is noted. However, this is an argument concerning the product and not to any specific claimed structural limitation of the claimed apparatus. The arguments presented by the applicants are unpersuasive and the rejections stand.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 1722


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel S. Luk whose telephone number is (571) 272-1134. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Fridays from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EL


JOSEPH S. DEL SOLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
8/7/06